

REMARKS

Claims 1-2, and 4-25 are currently pending. Claim 3 has been canceled. Claims 1-2, and 4-13 have been amended, and new claims 14-25 have been added. A clean copy of all pending claims as amended by this response is attached to this office action response.

IN THE CLAIMS:

A. Claim Objections

The Examiner has objected to claims 1-13 for various informalities. Applicant has amended the claims accordingly.

B. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

Examiner rejects claims 3, 5 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Applicant has amended the claims to fix the problems addressed by the Examiner.

C. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103

Examiner rejects claims 1, 4, 5, 10 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) or 102(e) as being anticipated by either Brown (U.S. Patent 5,835,884), Potzick (U.S. Patent 4,445,389), Ricebel et al. (U.S. Patent 6,202,494), or Gysling et al. (U.S. Patent 6,354,147). Further, the Examiner has rejected claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gysling et al. in view of Thurston et al. (U.S. Patent 6,442,996).

Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to reflect that the first and second sensing regions have a respective first and second compliance and further that the first and second compliance of the pipe is different in each of the sensing regions. Likewise, independent claim 10 recites that the first and second regions have respective first and second compliances, the second compliance being different than the first compliance.

Neither Brown, Potzick, Ricebel, Gysling, or Thurston disclose or suggest having a first and second compliance in the respective sensing regions as claimed by Applicant. Accordingly, these references, whether alone or in combination, cannot anticipate or render Applicant's claimed invention obvious.

Additionally, Applicant has added new claims 14-25. No new matter has been added by the addition of these claims. Both independent claims 15 and 25 contain the same limitation discussed above, namely that the first and second sensing regions have a respective first and second compliance wherein the first and second compliance are different. Therefore, the newly added claims are believed patentable as well.

* * * * *

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at 713-787-1499 with any questions, comments or suggestions relating to this patent application.

Respectfully submitted,



Terril G. Lewis
Reg. No. 46,065
Patent Attorney for Applicant

HOWREY SIMON ARNOLD & WHITE, LLP
750 Bering Drive
Houston, Texas 77057-2198

Date: Apr: 17, 2003